arXiv:1611.01694v2 [math.DS] 19 Nov 2016

ON THE CONSERVATIVE PASTING LEMMA

PEDRO TEIXEIRA

Abstract. Several C^r ($r \in Z^+$) perturbation tools are established in the volume preserving setting allowing for the pasting, extension, localized smoothing and local linearization of vector fields. For diffeomorphisms, a conservative linearized version of Franks lemma is proved.

1. Introduction

In [AM], Arbieto and Matheus introduced an important perturbation technique allowing for the pasting/extension of vector fields in the conservative (volume preserving) setting, of which numerous applications have been found. It is known that the statements and proofs of the main tools ([AM, Section 3.1]) are not quite correct (concerning the statements, see Warnings 1 and 2 below). Some of the problems have been identified in [AM2], but we are unaware of any reference correctly stating this kind of results and providing sound proofs. Moreover, closer inspection shows that in Theorem 3.1 [AM, p.1403], the hypothesis requiring the original vector fields X and Y to be $C^{1,\alpha}$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$ is superfluous, it is enough to assume that X and Y are C^1, a similar remark applying to the general C^r version (see Theorem 1 below).

Let M be a closed manifold, $U \subsetneq M$ an open neighbourhood of a compact set K such that $U \setminus K$ is connected and $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. In practice, one of the main uses of the pasting lemma is to achieve, in the conservative setting, the gluing of a vector field X with a C^r perturbation Y of the restriction of X to U, so that the resulting vector field Z is still C^r close to X, coincides with Y in a neighbourhood of K and with X in U^c. The C^r perturbation Y being a vector field defined only on U, the C^r norm of $Y - X|_U$ can be evaluated on that domain (see Section 5.1), as Y and all its derivatives up to order r remain bounded there. Theorem 1 shows, in particular, that vector field Z can be obtained so that the C^r norm of $Z - X$ is linearly bounded by that of $Y - X|_U$, for some fixed constant $C > 1$ depending only on r, K and U (and, of course, on the manifold's atlas, which is assumed to be fixed).

This note establishes general volume preserving C^r perturbation tools enabling for the gluing, extension, localized smoothing and local linearization of vector fields, that are suitable for applications and provides complete proofs. The proof of the pasting result for vector fields (Theorem 1) is constructive and essentially relies on a simple but ingenious global-to-local reduction procedure originally due to Moser [MO], rather than on Dacorogna-Moser Theorem [DM, Theorem 2, p.5] (incorrectly) invoked in [AM]. The main reason why optimal regularity results of Dacorogna-Moser type can be dispensed with is the absence of regularity loss in the divergence of the initial (non-conservative) perturbation: if X, $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ and $w = \xi Y + (1 - \xi)X$ (ξ smooth taking values on $[0, 1]$), then div w is still of class

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37C10; 58G20.

Key words and phrases. pasting lemma, C^r perturbation, divergence-free vector field, localized smoothing, local linearization, divergence equation, volume preserving diffeomorphism, Franks lemma.

C^r and C^r small if X and Y are C^r close. The main advantage of Moser's direct approach is the guaranty that the auxiliary "divergence canceling" vector field v satisfying div $v =$ div w will be (compactly) supported inside the open "transition annulus" $\Omega \subset U \setminus K$ (the set where the transition in w from vector field Y to X is set to take place, it will correspond to a small neighbourhood of the closure of $\{x \in M : 0 < \xi(x) < 1\}$), and thus extends by 0 to the whole M (in the C^r class). This is needed to guarantee that the divergence canceling operation $w - v$ producing Z does not change w outside Ω, so that Z still coincides with Y and X in K and U^c, respectively.

Still in the conservative setting and with the add of an additional homothety trick, a general local linearization result is proved for vector fields (Theorem 5). Finally we point out a localized smoothing result (Theorem 3) providing ideal control on the complement of the perturbed region, which has obvious advantages: one may conservatively C^r perturb a divergence-free vector field X in order to make it smooth inside any given open set U, while keeping X unchanged on the complement of U. The only result of this kind known to us in the conservative setting, without loss of regularity in closeness to the original vector field or diffeomorphism, is Avila's conservative localized smoothing for volume preserving C^1 maps [AV, Theorem 7] (which is much harder).

In the case of volume preserving C^r diffeomorphisms, to establish a C^r perturbation pasting lemma without loss of regularity in the closeness to the original diffeomorphism seems beyond the techniques presently available (the exception being the C^∞ case), the main difficulty being that the volume correcting diffeomorphism (neutralizing the volume distortion inside the transition annulus) must now be reconstructed from the determinant of the inverse of the preliminary (non-conservative) pasting diffeomorphism, which determinant is only of class C^{r-1} and C^{r-1} close to 1. Nevertheless, and with some limitations, it is still possible to establish reasonable pasting results in the Hölder setting (using optimal regularity tools), but special care must be taken due to the pathological continuity behaviour of the composition and inversion operators in these spaces. These results will be treated in a separate note. The problem mentioned above vanishes, however, when one considers "infinitesimal" perturbations of Franks lemma type in the C^1 setting, mainly due to Avila's conservative localized smoothing [AV, Theorem 7] and the related homothety trick. A linearized version of the conservative Franks lemma for C^1 diffeomorphisms is stated and proved in Section 4 (Theorem 6), essentially following Avila's approach.

2. Conservative pasting, extension, localized smoothing and local linearization of vector fields

Convention. Throughout this paper, *M is a (second countable, Hausdorff) connected orientable closed C^∞ manifold of dimension $n \geq 2$, equipped with a regular,*[1] *finite atlas $(V_i, \phi_i)_{i \leq m}$ and a C^∞ volume form ω.* By [MO, Lemma 2],[2] we can assume that, on each local chart, ω pushes forward to the canonical volume form on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\phi_i(V_i) = \lambda_i \mathbb{B}^n$, $\lambda_i > 0$; μ is the Lebesgue measure induced by ω on M.

Given an open set $U \subset M$, denote by $\mathfrak{X}^s(U)$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, the space of vector fields of class C^s defined on U and by $\mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(U)$ the subspace of those that are divergence-free in relation to ω, or equivalently, whose flows preserve μ. As

[1] See Section 5.1.

[2] As remarked in [DM, p.4 and 23], the proof given in [MO] is actually for the proposition without the hypothesis $\text{supp}(g - h) \subset Q$ and the conclusion $\text{supp}(u - \text{Id}) \subset Q$ (g, h being two smooth volume forms on the open n-cube Q with the same total volume, the proof produces a smooth diffeomorphism u realizing a pullback between them).

mentioned in the Introduction, in Theorem 1 we consider vector fields Y defined on open sets $U \subset M$. To guarantee that their C^r norms remain finite, we introduce the following

Definition 1. (C^r bounded) Let r, $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, $r \leq s$. $X \in \mathfrak{X}^s(U)$ is *C^r bounded* if X and all its derivatives up to order r are bounded on U. $\|\cdot\|_{C^r;U}$ is Whitney C^r norm ($\mathbb{N}_0 \ni r \leq s$) on $\mathfrak{X}^s(U)$ (Section 5.1). When $U = M$ we simply write $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$.

We recall the informal description of Theorem 1. *In the volume preserving setting*, let X be a vector field of class C^r on a closed manifold M and $U \subsetneq M$ an open neighbourhood of a compact set K. Given a C^r perturbation Y of the restriction of X to U, it is possible (provided $U \setminus K$ is connected), to C^r perturb X inside U only, so that the resulting vector field on M still coincides with Y in some neighbourhood of K. One interesting point is that the perturbation can be made C^∞ in the open set where the control over the dynamics is necessarily lost, i.e. on the "transition annulus" where the conservative "harmonization" of the two original vector fields takes place (this being the unavoidable cost of bringing together in the same vector field two more or less conflicting dynamics). As usual, $Y \not\equiv X|_U$ means that $Y(x) \neq X(x)$ for at least one point $x \in U$.

Theorem 1. (C^s conservative pasting with C^r closeness). *Let M be a manifold as above. Suppose that K is a compact subset with an open neighbourhood $U \subsetneq M$ such that $U \setminus K$ is connected. Then, given $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ and an integer $1 \leq r \leq s$, there is an open set $K \subset V \subset U$ and a constant $C = C(r, K, U) > 1$ such that: given $X \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ and a C^r bounded $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(U)$ such that $Y \not\equiv X|_U$, there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ satisfying:*

1. *$Z = Y$ in V;*
2. *$Z = X$ in a neighbourhood of U^c;*
3. *$\|Z - X\|_{C^r} < C \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U}$*

Moreover, V depends only on K and U and not on r, s and one may further require Z to be C^∞ at every point where it neither coincides with X nor with Y.

Actually the proof establishes a considerably more precise result:

Theorem 1'. *Let M, K, U, r and s be as above. Then, there is a constant $C = C(r, K, U) > 1$ and two disjoint compact n-submanifolds P and Q with smoothly diffeomorphic connected boundaries for which $K \subset \operatorname{int} P$ and $U^c \subset \operatorname{int} Q$ and such that: given $X \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ and a C^r bounded $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(U)$ such that $Y \not\equiv X|_U$, there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ satisfying:*

1. *$Z = Y$ in P;*
2. *$Z = X$ in Q;*
3. *Z is C^∞ in $\Omega = (P \cup Q)^c$, Ω being C^∞ diffeomorphic to $\partial P \times (0, 1)$;*
4. *$\|Z - X\|_{C^r} < C \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U}$*

(Moreover, P and Q depend only on K and U and not on r, s. Y needs only to be defined, C^r bounded and $\not\equiv X$ in some fixed open neighbourhood U_0 of P and inequality (4) then holds changing U for U_0).

Warning 1. It should be stressed that if $U \setminus K$ is *not* connected, then homological constraints might occur making (in general) impossible the conservative pasting of vector fields X and Y as stated in Theorem 1 (by *any* method and under *any* regularity assumptions, see Example 1). If $U \setminus K$ fails to be connected, a conservative C^r perturbation Y of the restriction of X to U may actually fail to have a divergence-free extension to the whole M, even if the C^r closeness condition is dropped (Example 2).

Example 1. Represent the flat 2-torus as $M = \mathbb{S}^1 \times (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ with coordinates (s, z) and endow it with the standard volume form. Let X be the vertical vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and consider its ϵ-C^∞ perturbation $Y = (1+\epsilon)\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$, $\epsilon \neq 0$. Then, there is no $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^1_\mu(M)$ such that (a) $Z = Y$ in $K = \mathbb{S}^1 \times 1/2$ and (b) $Z = X$ in $\gamma = \mathbb{S}^1 \times 1$. The vector fields X and Y have a different flux across the homologous cycles $\mathbb{S}^1 \times z$, thus the divergence of Z cannot identically vanish inside any of the two annulus bounded by K and γ.

Example 2. Extend the annulus $U = \mathbb{S}^1 \times (-1, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ to a smoothly embedded 2-sphere S, invariant under rotation about the z-axis and endowed with the canonical volume form inherited from $\mathbb{R}^3$. Endow S with the rotation vector field $X : (x, y, z) \mapsto (-y, x, 0)$ and consider the ϵ-C^∞ perturbation of the restriction of X to U given by $Y = (-y, x, \epsilon)$, $\epsilon > 0$. Both X and Y are divergence-free but there is no C^1 divergence-free extension of Y to the whole S, as the flux of Y across the (bounding) cycle $\gamma = \mathbb{S}^1 \times 0$ is not zero, the divergence being necessarily positive around some point of the south hemisphere.

Warning 2. The dependence of constant C on r, K and U is obviously unavoidable, whatever the method employed to achieve the pasting of the vector fields. For instance, given a point $p \in M$, in some local chart set $K = \{p\}$ and $U = B_d(p)$ a small open ball whose closure is contained in the chart. Since $d = \operatorname{dist}(K, U^c)$, the mean value theorem then implies that $C = C(r, K, U) > d^{-r}$. In general and by the same reason, for K and U as in Theorem 1, a "thin" $U \setminus K$ implies a quite large C. More precisely, assume for the moment that M is endowed with a Riemannian structure inducing an intrinsic metric (this structure is actually unnecessary for the results here obtained). Suppose that for each $\epsilon > 0$, U_ϵ is an open neighbourhood of K contained in $B_\epsilon(K)$ with $U_\epsilon \setminus K$ connected. Then $C(r, K, U_\epsilon) \to \infty$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. To get an idea of how the "geometry" of $U \setminus K$ tends to impact the size of C, and in the specific context of the method employed here to solve equation $\operatorname{div} v = h$, observe that, roughly speaking, the "thinner" and possibly more "convoluted" the image of $U_\epsilon \setminus K$ on the atlas as ϵ tends to zero, the larger the number $N + 1$ of small cubes U_j needed to achieve the covering

$$\overline{\Omega_1} \subset \cup_{j=0}^N U_j \subset \Omega \subset U_\epsilon \setminus K$$

(see the proof of Theorem 1) and a large number of small cubes contributes to C with a very large multiplicative factor (the smaller the cubes the larger this factor becomes, see, in particular, Section 2 (c) and Footnote 5). Together, this and the previous Warning impose double caution on the use of the pasting lemma to attempt general perturbations of divergence-free vector fields with a priori unspecified support (however, see Theorem 5). As stated, with δ independent of K and U, Theorem 3.1 in [AM] contradicts the mean value theorem, assuming, as implicit, that W^c is nonempty (in the paper's notation).

The proof of next result corrects and generalizes that of [AM, Theorem 2.2]. It provides a short alternative way to establish Zuppa's density theorem [ZU] without the need to introduce a Riemannian structure on the manifold.

Theorem 2. *Let M be a manifold as above and $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then,*

$$\mathfrak{X}^\infty_\mu(M) \text{ is } C^r\text{-dense in } \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M).$$

Proof. Let $(V_i, \phi_i)_{i \leq m}$ be the atlas of M. There is no difficulty in finding a partition of unity $\xi_{i \leq m}$ subordinate to $V_{i \leq m}$ with $\xi_1 = 1$ in $\phi_1^{-1}(\frac{2\lambda_1}{3}\mathbb{D}^n)$ (see the Convention above). Let $X_i = (X_i^1, \ldots, X_i^n)$, $i \leq m$, be the expressions of $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ in the local charts. Since the atlas is regular (see Footnote 7), using convolutions one

can find, for each i, a sequence X_{ik} of smooth vector fields on $\phi_i(V_i) = \lambda_i \mathbb{B}^n$ C^r converging to X_i. Observe that, as X_i, each X_{ik} is divergence-free (in relation to the standard volume form on $\mathbb{R}^n$), since the convolution operator $*$ is bilinear and satisfies $\partial_j(\rho * X_i^j) = \rho * \partial_j X_i^j$. To simplify the notation, one still denotes by X_{ik} the pullback $\phi_i^*(X_{ik})$, which we extend by 0 to the whole M (this extension is in general discontinuous, but this is made irrelevant by the action of the cutoff functions). Define the smooth vector field on M,

$$Y_k = \sum_{i \leq m} \xi_i X_{ik}$$

Since $\sum_{i \leq m} \xi_i = 1$, the estimate for the $|\cdot|_r$ norm of the product (end of Section 5.1) gives

$$|Y_k - X|_r = \Big| \sum_{i \leq m} \xi_i (X_{ik} - X) \Big|_r \leq m 2^r \max_{i \leq m} |\xi_i|_r \max_{i \leq m} |X_{ik} - X|_{V_i}|_r \tag{2.1}$$

Since X is divergence-free,

$$\operatorname{div} Y_k = \operatorname{div} Y_k - \operatorname{div} X = \operatorname{div}(Y_k - X) = \sum_{i \leq m;\, j \leq n} (\partial_j \xi_i)\big(X_{ik}^j - X^j\big)$$

and

$$|\operatorname{div} Y_k|_r \leq mn 2^r \max_{i \leq m} \big|\xi_i\big|_{r+1} \max_{i \leq m} |X_{ik} - X|_{V_i}|_r \tag{2.2}$$

As the norms $|\cdot|_r$ and $\big\|\cdot\big\|_{C^r}$ are equivalent (Section 5.1) we work with the former. From (2.1) and (2.2) it follows that

$$|Y_k - X|_r \,,\, |\operatorname{div} Y_k|_r \xrightarrow[k \to \infty]{} 0 \;\text{ since }\; X_{ik} \xrightarrow[k \to \infty]{C^r} X|_{V_i} \tag{2.3}$$

Now, $\operatorname{div} Y_k = 0$ in $\mathcal{D} = \phi_1^{-1}(\frac{2\lambda_1}{3}\mathbb{D}^n)$, since, $\xi_1|_{\mathcal{D}} = 1$ and thus $Y_k = X_{1k}$ in this set. Let $\Omega = M \setminus \phi_1^{-1}(\frac{\lambda_1}{3}\mathbb{D}^n)$ and $\Omega_1 = M \setminus \phi_1^{-1}(\frac{\lambda_1}{2}\mathbb{D}^n)$. Let $h_k = \operatorname{div} Y_k|_\Omega$. Clearly $\overline{\Omega_1} \subset \Omega$ and $\operatorname{supp} h_k \subset \Omega_1$. Observe that Ω is connected since M and $\partial\Omega$ (diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$) are both connected, and the same holds for Ω_1. Moreover, $\int_\Omega h_k \omega = 0$ (ω being the volume form on M), since by the divergence theorem,

$$\int_\Omega (\operatorname{div} Y_k)\omega = \int_{\partial\Omega} Y_k \lrcorner\, \omega = -\int_{\partial\mathcal{B}} X_{1k} \lrcorner\, \omega = -\int_{\mathcal{B}} (\operatorname{div} X_{1k})\omega = 0$$

where $\mathcal{B} = \phi_1^{-1}(\frac{\lambda_1}{3}\mathbb{B}^n)$. Now, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 1 (below), there is a constant $C = C(r, \Omega_1, \Omega) > 0$ and $v_k \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div} v_k = h_k \\ \operatorname{supp} v_k \subset \Omega \\ |v_k|_r \leq C\,|h_k|_r \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

Extend v_k by 0 to the whole M and let $Z_k = Y_k - v_k$. Then, $Z_k \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty_\mu(M)$ and finally by (2.3) and (2.4),

$$|Z_k - X|_r \leq |Y_k - X|_r + |v_k|_r \xrightarrow[k \to \infty]{} 0$$

□

The next result permits to conservatively C^r perturb a divergence-free vector field X to make it smooth inside any given open set U, while keeping X unchanged on the complement of U. It has over Theorem 1 the advantage of avoiding the occurrence of a transition annulus, where typically Z is neither smooth nor it coincides with X. If, for instance, one needs to conservatively C^r perturb a vector field X in order to increase its regularity, we may do so while keeping X unchanged on

any prescribed compact set D where X is already regular enough for our purpose. The advantages in terms of dynamical control are evident.

Theorem 3. (Conservative localized smoothing). *Let M be a manifold as above. Given $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, an open set $\Omega \subset M$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ satisfying:*

(1) *Z is C^∞ in Ω;*
(2) *$Z = X$ in Ω^c;*
(3) *$\|Z - X\|_{C^r} < \epsilon$.*

The proof easily reduces to the case where $\overline{\Omega}$ is smoothly diffeomorphic the closed ball $\mathbb{D}^n$, and thus to Lemma 1 below.

Proof. Take a locally finite cover of Ω by euclidean (open) balls $B_{k\geq 0}$ contained in this set (each $\overline{B_k}$ is smoothly diffeomorphic to the closed ball $\mathbb{D}^n$, see Footnote 8). We inductively define a sequence $Z_k \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ as follows: $Z_0 = X$ and for $k \geq 0$, $Z_{k+1} \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ is given by Lemma 1 and satisfies

- Z_{k+1} is C^∞ in B_k
- $Z_{k+1} = Z_k$ in B_k^c
- $\|Z_{k+1} - Z_k\|_{C^r} < \frac{\epsilon}{2^{k+1}}$

Then, Z_k is a Cauchy sequence in the Banach space $\mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ and thus C^r converges to some $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$. It is immediate to verify that Z satisfies conditions (1) to (3). □

Lemma 1. (Conservative localized smoothing). *Let M be a manifold as above and $N \subset M$ a compact n-submanifold with connected smooth boundary. Given $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ satisfying:*

(1) *Z is C^∞ in $\operatorname{int} N$;*
(2) *$Z = X$ in $(\operatorname{int} N)^c$;*
(3) *$\|Z - X\|_{C^r} < \epsilon$.*

Proof's preview (Lemma 1). The idea is to use the collar structure of N near ∂N to build, in the natural way, a locally finite covering of $\Omega = \operatorname{int} N$ consisting of an isotopic copy Λ_0 of Ω (obtained removing a compact collar from N), plus an infinite chain $\Lambda_{k\geq 1}$ of overlapping "annuli" diffeomorphic to $\partial N \times (0, 1)$, whose closures approach ∂N in the Hausdorff topology. Taking a partition of unity $\xi_{k\geq 0}$ subordinate to this covering and a sequence $X_k \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty_\mu(M)$ C^r converging to X, one defines a smooth vector field on Ω by

$$Y = \sum_{k\geq 0} \xi_k X_k$$

which, however, fails in general to be divergence-free in an infinite sequence of "transition annuli" $\Omega_{k\geq 0}$ corresponding to the regions where the Λ_k's overlap (in pairs). We may then use the method employed in the proof of Theorem 1 to find, for each Ω_k, a smooth, divergence-canceling vector field v_k compactly supported inside this set. As in (2.4) above (proof of Theorem 2), the C^r norm of each v_k is linearly bounded by that of $h_k = \operatorname{div} Y|_{\Omega_k}$. The sequence of constants $C_k > 0$ giving these linear bounds actually goes to infinite with k because the "annuli" Ω_k get thinner and thinner as they approach ∂N (see Warning 2 above). Nevertheless, it can be shown that if the C^r convergence $X_k \to X$ is fast enough, it compensates for the divergence of the C_k sequence and the divergence-free smooth vector field $Z = Y - \sum_{k\geq 0} v_k$ on Ω can be extended by X to the whole M (in the C^r class) and be made as C^r close to X as wished.

Proof. Since the norms $|\cdot|_r$ and $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$ are equivalent we work with the former. Fix a smooth collar embedding

$$\zeta : \partial N \times [0,\infty) \hookrightarrow N$$

Consider the open covering of $\Omega = \operatorname{int} N$ given by

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda_0 = \Omega \setminus \zeta\big(\partial N \times [0, \frac{1}{3}]\big) \\ \Lambda_k = \zeta\big(\partial N \times (\frac{1}{2k+3}, \frac{1}{2k})\big), \quad k \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

and fix a smooth partition of unity $\xi_{k\geq 0}$ of Ω subordinate to it. Take a sequence $X_k \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty_\mu(M)$, $k \geq 0$, converging to X in the C^r norm and define the smooth vector field Y on Ω as in the Preview. Let

$$\Omega_k = \zeta\big(\partial N \times (\tfrac{1}{2k+3}, \tfrac{1}{2k+2})\big), \quad k \geq 0$$

Note that these "transition annulus" are mutually disjoint. By subordination of $\xi_{k\geq 0}$ to the covering,

$$\xi_k + \xi_{k+1} = 1 \text{ in } \overline{\Omega_k} \tag{2.5}$$

thus

$$Y|_{\overline{\Omega_k}} = \xi_k X_k + \xi_{k+1} X_{k+1} \tag{2.6}$$

and using estimate for the $|\cdot|_r$ norm of the product (Section 5.1)

$$|Y - X|_{r;\overline{\Omega_k}} = \Big| \sum_{i=0,\,1} \xi_{k+i}(X_{k+i} - X) \Big|_{r;\overline{\Omega_k}} \leq 2^{r+1} \big|\xi_k\big|_r \max_{i=0,\,1} |X_{k+i} - X|_r \tag{2.7}$$

Let $h_k = \operatorname{div} Y|_{\Omega_k}$. Observe that h_k is smooth and $\operatorname{supp} h_k \subset \Omega_k$. Also, Ω_k is connected with smooth boundary (∂N being connected) and

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\int_{\Omega_k} h_k \omega = \int_{\partial \Omega_k} Y \lrcorner\, \omega \quad &= -\textstyle\int_{\partial N_k} X_k \lrcorner\, \omega + \int_{\partial N_k^*} X_{k+1} \lrcorner\, \omega \\ &= -\textstyle\int_{N_k} (\operatorname{div} X_k)\omega + \int_{N_k^*} (\operatorname{div} X_{k+1})\omega \\ &= 0 + 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where for $k \geq 0$,

$$N_k = N \setminus \zeta\big(\partial N \times [0, \tfrac{1}{2k+2}]\big) \text{ and } N_k^* = N \setminus \zeta\big(\partial N \times [0, \tfrac{1}{2k+3}]\big)$$

Extend h_k by 0 to the whole Ω. As the partition of unity is fixed, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 2 (see the proof of Theorem 1 for details), we can find a sequence of constants $C_k > 0$, each depending only r, Ω_k, ξ_k and ξ_{k+1} and vector fields $v_k \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div} v_k = h_k \\ \operatorname{supp} v_k \subset \Omega_k \\ |v_k|_{r;\Omega} \leq C_k \, |h_k|_{r;\Omega} \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

Then,

$$Z = Y - \sum_{k\geq 0} v_k$$

defines a smooth divergence-free vector field on Ω, as each v_k cancels the divergence of Y on the transition annulus Ω_k (these being mutually disjoint) and Y is divergence-free on the complement of the union of those sets. By (2.5) and (2.6) (c.f. the proof of Theorem 2),

$$h_k|_{\overline{\Omega_k}} = \operatorname{div}(Y - X)|_{\overline{\Omega_k}} = \sum_{i=0,1\,;\,j\leq n} (\partial_j \xi_{k+i})\big(X^j_{k+i} - X^j\big)$$

thus

$$|h_k|_{r;\overline{\Omega_k}} \leq n 2^{r+1} \big|\xi_k\big|_{r+1} \max_{i=0,1} |X_{k+i} - X|_r \tag{2.9}$$

Now observe that by (2.7) - (2.9), taking a sufficiently fast converging subsequence of X_k, still reindexed as X_k, we can make, simultaneously, $(Y-X)|_{\overline{\Omega_k}}$, h_k and thus v_k as C^r small as pleased and have, simultaneously,

$$|Y-X|_{r;\overline{\Omega_k}}\,, \quad |v_k|_{r;\overline{\Omega_k}}\,, \quad |Y-X|_{r;\overline{\Gamma_k}} = |X_k - X|_{r;\overline{\Gamma_k}} < \tfrac{\epsilon}{k+2} \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$\Gamma_0 = N \setminus \zeta\big(\partial N \times [0, \tfrac{1}{2})\big) \;\text{ and }\; \Gamma_k = \zeta\big(\partial N \times [\tfrac{1}{2k+2}, \tfrac{1}{2k+1}]\big),\;\; k \geq 1$$

thus guaranteeing

$$\begin{aligned} |Z-X|_{r;\Omega} &\leq |Z-Y|_{r;\Omega} + |Y-X|_{r;\Omega} \\ &= \max_{k\geq 0} |v_k|_{r;\Omega} + \max_{k\geq 0}\big(|Y-X|_{r;\overline{\Omega_k}}\,, |X_k - X|_{r;\overline{\Gamma_k}}\big) \\ &< \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

(as the v_k's have mutually disjoint supports and Ω is the union of the Ω_k's and the Γ_k's). It remains to show that $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty_\mu(\Omega)$ extends by X to the whole M in the C^r class. By (2.10) and (2.11),

$$|Z-X|_{r;\Gamma_k \cup \Omega_k} < \tfrac{2\epsilon}{k+2} \xrightarrow[k\to\infty]{} 0$$

hence as one approaches ∂N, Z is C^r closer and closer to X since letting

$$\Theta_l = \bigcup_{k\geq l} \Gamma_k \cup \Omega_k, \quad l \geq 0$$

each $\Theta_l \cup \partial N$ is a neighbourhood of ∂N in N. Therefore Z and all its partial derivatives up to order r extend continuously to $N = \overline{\Omega}$, these extensions taking at each point of ∂N the values taken by X and its partial derivatives (up to order r). Extend Z by X to the whole M. Clearly this extension is continuous. Pushing forward Z by a boundary rectifying smooth diffeomorphism around each $x \in \partial N$ and using induction over the order of the multiindices, a direct application of the mean value theorem immediately gives that Z has partial derivatives of all orders up to r at each point of ∂N agreeing with those of X and thus these exist and are continuous all over M (see above). Therefore Z is C^r and $|Z-X|_r < \epsilon$ by (2.11), which completes the proof. □

The next result shows that if in Theorem 1 we want to have Z satisfying (1) and (3) but are not particularly interested in having (2) $Z = X$ in U^c, then the regularity of Z can be increased to that of Y and it can actually be made C^∞ on the complement of $\overline{V}$. Obviously, if $Y = X|_U$ one uses Theorem 3 instead.

Theorem 4. (C^s conservative extension with C^r closeness). *Let M be a manifold as above. Suppose that K is a compact subset with an open neighbourhood $U \subsetneq M$ such that $U \setminus K$ is connected. Then, given $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ and an integer $1 \leq r \leq s$, there is an open set $K \subset V \subset U$ and a constant $C = C(r, K, U) > 1$ (that provided by Theorem 1) such that: given $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r_\mu(M)$ and a C^r bounded $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(U)$ such that $Y \not\equiv X|_U$, there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ satisfying:*

(1) *$Z = Y$ in $\overline{V}$;*
(2) *Z is C^∞ in $\overline{V}^c$;*
(3) *$\|Z-X\|_{C^r} < C\,\|Y-X\|_{C^r;U}$*

Proof. Let $C_0 = C - 1/2$, where $C = C(r, K, U) > 1$ is the constant given by Theorem 1. Using Theorem 2, get $X_0 \in \mathfrak{X}^\infty_\mu(M)$ such that

$$\|X_0 - X\|_{C^r} \leq \tfrac{1}{2(C_0+1)}\,\|Y-X\|_{C^r;U}$$

Note that $X_0|_U \not\equiv Y$. By Theorem 1, there are $Z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ and an open set $K \subset V \subset U$ such that $Z_0 = Y$ in $\overline{V}$ and

$$\|Z_0 - X_0\|_{C^r} < C \|Y - X_0\|_{C^r;U}$$

Actually, we may replace C by C_0 in the above inequality getting

$$\|Z_0 - X_0\|_{C^r} < C_0 \|Y - X_0\|_{C^r;U}$$

for (see the beginning of Section 3 and Footnote 4) $C = n^{(r+1)/2}C'$ and we could have defined $C' = 2^r |\alpha|_r + C_0 + 1/2$ instead still guaranteeing that (3.1) holds. Then,

$$\|Y - X_0\|_{C^r;U} \leq \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U} + \|X - X_0\|_{C^r} \leq \left(1 + \tfrac{1}{2(C_0+1)}\right) \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z_0 - X\|_{C^r} &\leq \|Z_0 - X_0\|_{C^r} + \|X_0 - X\|_{C^r} \\ &< C_0\left(1 + \tfrac{1}{2(C_0+1)}\right) \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U} + \tfrac{1}{2(C_0+1)} \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U} \\ &= (C_0 + 1/2) \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U} = C \|Y - X\|_{C^r;U} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, apply Theorem 3 to Z_0 and $\Omega = \overline{V}^c$ in order to get $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ satisfying (1) - (3). □

Theorem 1 can be used to prove that a divergence-free vector field can be conservatively C^1 perturbed to become linearized near $x \in M$, the perturbation support being a neighbourhood of x as small as pleased. Although the main application occurs when the points of Σ are singularities of v, we formulate it in the general case. As with Theorem 6, care has been taken to find a δ that directly estimates the permitted variation of the derivative on all local charts. Observe that given $\epsilon > 0$, the same δ (depending linearly on ϵ) works simultaneously for all divergence-free vector fields on M in all classes of regularity (c.f. Theorem 6 below).

Theorem 5. (C^s conservative local linearization - "Franks lemma type"). *Let M be a manifold as above. Then, there is a constant $\chi > 0$ (depending only on the atlas of M) such that: given*

- *any $\epsilon > 0$;*
- *any $v \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$;*
- *any finite set $\Sigma \subset M$;*
- *any neighbourhood U of Σ;*
- *any traceless linear maps $A_x \in L(n, \mathbb{R})$, $x \in \Sigma$, satisfying*

$$\|A_x - Dv(x)\| < \chi\epsilon$$

where $Dv(x)$ is taken in some (reindexed) local chart (V_x, ϕ_x) around x, there exists $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ satisfying:

(1) *for each $x \in \Sigma$, on local chart (V_x, ϕ_x),*
$Z(y) = v(x) + A_x(y - x)$ *near x;*
(2) *$Z = v$ in U^c;*
(3) *$\|Z - v\|_{C^1} < \epsilon$.*

Remark 1. (1) implies, for each $x \in \Sigma$, that $Z(x) = v(x)$, and on local chart (V_x, ϕ_x), $DZ(x) = A_x$ and Z is affine linear near x.

Proof's preview (Theorem 5).

The attentive reader will notice that Theorem 5 is *not* a particular case of Theorem 1. The result easily reduces to the case Σ consists of a single point. The problem is obviously a local one, the construction being carried out on some chosen local chart (performing a translation we may assume that $x = 0$). Instead of trying

to prove directly that, for any traceless $A \in L(n,\mathbb{R})$ sufficiently close to $Dv(0)$, pasting adequately $Y(y) = v(0) + A(y)$ to v on a sufficiently small neighbourhood U of x (using Theorem 1) we can get a divergence-free vector field C^1 close to v, with the inherent problem of controlling the growth of constant $C = C(1, K, U)$ as U "blows down" to x, we proceed differently and re-scale to the open unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n$, the restrictions of vector fields Y and v to arbitrarily small balls $\lambda\mathbb{B}^n$ (under the action of homotheties $\Phi_\lambda = \lambda^{-1}\mathrm{Id}$). After showing that the C^1 norm of the vector field

$$Y_\lambda - v_\lambda = \Phi_{\lambda_*}(Y - v) \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(\mathbb{B}^n)$$

tends to $\|A - Dv(0)\|$ as $\lambda \to 0^+$, we perform the pasting on this constant scale, with fixed K, U and $C = C(1, K, U)$ and then pullback (scale down) the resulting vector field to the original real scale, i.e. to a sufficiently small ball $\lambda\mathbb{B}^n$, finally extending it by v to the whole M, the non increasing behaviour of the C^1 norm under the action of homothetic contractions guaranteeing the desired conclusion.

Remark 2. In the proof of Theorem 5 we will need to apply Theorem 1 with M an open ball $\eta\mathbb{B}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Theorem 1 remains valid if the manifold M is instead an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ equipped with the trivial one chart atlas (M, Id) and both $X, Y \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ are C^r bounded (see Definition 1) and μ *is the Lebesgue measure induced by the the canonical volume on* $\mathbb{R}^n$. The proof is actually simpler than that of Theorem 1 since the only chart transition is the identity on M (in particular, the construction of auxiliary vector field v from h is that given in [CDK, Proposition 9.7] and constant D in Section 2 (c) is replaced by 1). For any open set $U \subset M \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the C^r norms ($\mathbb{N}_0 \ni r \leq s$) of a C^r bounded $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^s(U)$ reduce to (see also Section 5.1)

$$\|Y\|_{C^r;U} := \max_{0\leq k\leq r} \sup_U \left\|D^k Y\right\| \text{ and } |Y|_{r;U} := \max_{i\,;\,0\leq|\alpha|\leq r} \sup_U \left|\partial^\alpha Y^i\right|$$

No other changes are needed.

Proof. (of Theorem 5). Chose a local chart around each $x \in \Sigma$ and fix on it a small closed ball $\overline{B_x}$ centred at x (we identify x with its image on the chart), so that these balls have disjoint preimages on M and are contained in U. Changing U by the union of the interiors of these $|\Sigma|$ balls it is immediate that the proof reduces to the case of Σ consisting of a single point x. Let $D = D(n, 1, \max_{i,j\leq m} \|\phi_{ji}\|_{C^2}) \geq 1$ be the constant controlling the potential magnification of the local C^1 norm of a vector field under the chart transitions of the atlas (see (c), Section 3). Get constant $C = C(1, \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{D}^n, \frac{2}{3}\mathbb{B}^n)$ given by Theorem 1 for $M = \mathbb{B}^n$ taking Remark 2 into consideration and let $\chi = (CD)^{-1}$. Take a local chart (W, ϕ) around x. Performing a translation we may assume that $\phi(x) = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Take $\eta > 0$ such that $\eta\mathbb{D}^n \subset \phi(W)$ and $\phi^{-1}(\eta\mathbb{D}^n) \subset U$. To simplify the notation we still denote by v the vector field $\phi_* v|_W \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(\phi(W))$ (recall that the atlas is regular (see Section 5.1), hence this local chart expression of v is C^1 bounded; μ is now the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$). Fix any traceless $A \in L(n,\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\|A - Dv(0)\| < \chi\epsilon$$

(recall that $\phi(x) = 0$ and $Dv(0)$ is taken on local chart (W, ϕ)). We assume that v coincides with the vector field $v(0) + A$ in no neighbourhood of 0, otherwise we are done. Define on $\eta\mathbb{B}^n$,

$$Y(y) = v(0) + A(y) - v(y)$$

(Homothety trick - Step 1). Re-scaling to the unit scale. For each $0 < \lambda < \eta$, re-scale $Y|_{\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}$ to the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n$

$$Y_\lambda = \left(\lambda^{-1}\mathrm{Id}\right)_* Y|_{\lambda\mathbb{B}^n} \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(\mathbb{B}^n)$$

CLAIM. $\|Y_\lambda\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} \xrightarrow[\lambda\to 0^+]{} \|A - Dv(0)\|$.
Recall (Remark 2) that $\|Y_\lambda\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} = \max\big(\|Y_\lambda\|_{C^0;\mathbb{B}^n}, \sup_{x\in\mathbb{B}^n}\|DY_\lambda\|\big)$.
(a) The derivative is unchanged by the action of the homothety,

$$DY_\lambda(y) = DY(\lambda y) = A - Dv(\lambda x) \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{B}^n$$

therefore, since v is C^1,

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{B}^n}\|DY_\lambda\| = \sup_{y\in\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}\|DY\| \xrightarrow[\lambda\to 0^+]{} \|A - Dv(0)\|$$

(b) as for the C^0 norm,

$$\|Y_\lambda\|_{C^0;\mathbb{B}^n} = \lambda^{-1}\|Y\|_{C^0;\lambda\mathbb{B}^n} \xrightarrow[\lambda\to 0^+]{} \|A - Dv(0)\|$$

since

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{-1}\|Y\|_{C^0;\lambda\mathbb{B}^n} &= \sup_{y\in\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}\lambda^{-1}|v(0) + A(y) - v(y)| = \\ &= \sup_{y\in\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}\left|\tfrac{v(0)+Dv(0;y)-v(y)}{\lambda} + \tfrac{A(y)-Dv(0;y)}{\lambda}\right| \xrightarrow[\lambda\to 0^+]{} \|A - Dv(0)\|\end{aligned}$$

as it is immediate to verify: the fraction on the left converges to $0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $\lambda \to 0^+$, while

$$\sup_{y\in\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}\frac{|A(y) - Dv(0;y)|}{\lambda} = \sup_{y\in\mathbb{B}^n}|A(y) - Dv(0;y)| = \|A - Dv(0)\|$$

Therefore, for $0 < \lambda < \eta$ small enough

$$\|Y_\lambda\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} < \chi\epsilon$$

(Step 2). PERFORMING THE PASTING. Letting $X \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{B}^n$, recalling that by hypothesis $Y_\lambda \not\equiv 0$ (see above), by Theorem 1 (and Remark 2), there is $Z_1 \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(\mathbb{B}^n)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} Z_1 = Y_\lambda & \text{in } \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{B}^n \\ Z_1 = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{2}{3}\mathbb{B}^n \\ \|Z_1\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} < C\|Y_\lambda\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} < C\chi\epsilon = \epsilon/D \end{cases}$$

(Step 3). SCALING DOWN TO THE REAL SCALE. Pullback Z_1 to the "real scale" defining

$$Z_0 = \left(\lambda^{-1}\mathrm{Id}\right)^* Z_1 \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(\lambda\mathbb{B}^n)$$

compactly supported in $\lambda\mathbb{B}^n$. Extend Z_0 by 0 to the whole $\eta\mathbb{B}^n$ and define on this set, $Z = Z_0 + v$. Then, $Z = v(0) + A$ in $\frac{\lambda}{3}\mathbb{B}^n$, $Z = v$ in $\eta\mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{2\lambda}{3}\mathbb{B}^n$ and (see the end of the Preview),

$$\|Z - v\|_{C^1;\eta\mathbb{B}^n} = \|Z_0\|_{C^1;\lambda\mathbb{B}^n} \le \|Z_1\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} < \epsilon/D$$

We finally get the desired $Z \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ extending the pullback $\phi^*(Z)$ by v to the whole M. Note that $Z - v \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ is compactly supported inside $\phi^{-1}(\eta\mathbb{B}^n)$, thus the global C^1 norm of $Z - v$ satisfies

$$(3)\quad \|Z - v\|_{C^1} \le D\|Z_0\|_{C^1;\lambda\mathbb{B}^n} < \epsilon$$

and it is immediate to verify that (1) and (2) are also satisfied. □

Proof's preview (Theorem 1).

Using Lemma 3 (Section 5.3) and the existence of collars for manifolds with boundary, fix W_0 and W_1, two compact n-submanifolds with C^∞ boundary such that

$$K \subset \operatorname{int} W_0, \quad W_0 \subset \operatorname{int} W_1, \quad W_1 \subset U, \quad \Omega{:=}(\operatorname{int} W_1) \setminus W_0 \text{ is connected}$$

The transition from Y to X will take place inside the open set Ω. Fix $\alpha \in C^\infty(M;[0,1])$ such that $\alpha = 1$ in a small neighbourhood of W_0 and $\alpha = 0$ in a small neighbourhood of $(\operatorname{int} W_1)^c$. Now given any X, Y as in the statement let

$$\begin{cases} w = \alpha Y + (1-\alpha)X & \text{in } U \\ w = X & \text{in } U^c \end{cases}$$

Note that $w \in \mathfrak{X}^s(M)$ since $\alpha = 0$ in a neighbourhood of U^c and Y is defined and of class C^s on U. Since both $X \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ and $Y \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(U)$ are divergence-free,

$$h := \operatorname{div} w \in C^s(M)$$

and

$$h \text{ is } C^r\text{-small if } Y - X|_U \text{ is } C^r\text{-small}$$

as $h = \operatorname{div} X = 0$ in a neighbourhood of U^c and (on local charts),

$$h = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\partial_i \alpha)(Y^i - X^i) \text{ in } U \tag{2.12}$$

Clearly, h is (compactly) supported inside Ω. In order to get $Z_0 \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ satisfying (1) and (2), it is enough to find $v \in \mathfrak{X}^s(M)$ supported inside Ω such that

$$\operatorname{div} v = h = \operatorname{div} w$$

and then let $Z_0 = w - v$, thus canceling the divergence of w inside the "transition annulus" Ω, while keeping w unaltered outside that open set (in particular, $Z_0 = w = Y$ in a neighbourhood of W_0 and $Z_0 = w = X$ in a neighbourhood of $(\operatorname{int} W_1)^c \supset U^c$). Since the smooth scalar function α is fixed, by (2.13) the C^r norm of h is linearly bounded by that of $Y - X$,

$$|h|_r \leq n 2^r \big|\alpha\big|_{r+1} \, |Y - X|_r \tag{2.13}$$

and it can be shown that (3) holds (see Section 3). The crucial facts that guarantee the existence of canceling vector field v are: (a) the connectedness of Ω, (b) $\operatorname{supp} h \subset \Omega$ and (c) $\int_\Omega h\omega = 0$, this equality following readily from the divergence theorem since X, Y are divergence-free vector fields, w coincides with Y and X in ∂W_0 and ∂W_1 (respectively) and $\partial\overline{\Omega} = \partial W_0 \sqcup \partial W_1$ (see the proof of Theorem 2). The actual construction of v uses the global-to-local reduction technique originally devised by Moser in [MO], essentially aiming to solve, under condition (c), equation $\det Df = 1 + h$ on closed manifolds. We shall follow a complete presentation of the transposition of this technique to the solution of $\operatorname{div} u = h$ on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (under specific support premises) given by Csató, Dacorogna and Kneuss [CDK, p.184-188]. Once we get in this way Z_0 satisfying (1) to (3), one finally gets Z applying the localized smoothing (Theorem 3) to the open set

$$\Delta = \{x \in M : \, Z_0(x) \neq X(x), \, Y(x)\}.$$

Proof. According to the Preview, it remains to define Ω and α precisely and then solve

$$\operatorname{div} v = h, \quad v \in \mathfrak{X}^s(M) \text{ supported inside } \Omega$$

The existence of constant $C = C(r, K, U)$ satisfying (3) is proved in Section 3. We start by carefully constructing Ω and an auxiliary domain Ω_1, which is needed in our approach.

(A) Construction of Ω, Ω_1, V and w. Using Lemma 3 (Section 5.3), fix a compact n-submanifold P with *connected* C^∞ boundary such that $K \subset \operatorname{int} P$ and $P \subset U$. By the existence of collars for P [HI, p.113], there are four smoothly isotopic (nested) manifolds $P_{i\leq 4}$ satisfying

$$K \subset \operatorname{int} P_1, \qquad P_i \subset \operatorname{int} P_{i+1} \quad (i \leq 3), \qquad P_4 = P$$

and such that

$$\Omega := (\operatorname{int} P_4) \setminus P_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Omega_1 := (\operatorname{int} P_3) \setminus P_2$$

are both diffeomorphic to $\partial P \times]0,1[$, hence connected open sets. Exactly as described in the Preview, fix a scalar function α for $W_0 = P_2$ and $W_1 = P_3$ (the same for all X and Y) and define w and h accordingly. Clearly $h \in C^s(M)$ is supported inside Ω_1, $\overline{\Omega_1} \subset \Omega$ and $\int_\Omega h\omega = 0$. We set $V = \operatorname{int} P_1$.

(B) Finding divergence canceling vector field v. In order to find $v \in \mathfrak{X}^s(M)$ supported inside Ω and satisfying $\operatorname{div} v = h$, we may now apply the procedure in [CDK, p.184-188], reducing this problem to the solution of finitely many local equations

$$\operatorname{div} v_j = h_j, \quad v_j \in \mathfrak{X}^s(Q_j) \tag{2.14}$$

with v_j compactly supported inside the open cube $Q_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The construction in [CDK] carries almost verbatim to our closed manifold M, as the integrals involved in the definition of the auxiliary functions h_j are invariant under chart transition (see below).

Briefly, since $\overline{\Omega_1} \subset \Omega$ is compact, it can be covered by finitely many small open sets $U_j \subset \Omega$, $0 \leq j \leq N$, $N \geq 3$, such that the image of each U_j on some (reindexed) local chart (V_j, ϕ_j) is an open cube $Q_j \subset \phi_j(V_j) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of volume ≤ 1.[3] Clearly, N depends only on Ω_1 and Ω and thus ultimately only on K and U. Auxiliary functions $h_j \in C^s(M)$ are now constructed exactly as in [CDK, p.185, Lemma 9.9]. These are well defined since the atlas is volume preserving, thus implying that all integrals of scalar functions involved [CDK, p.187] are invariant under chart transition (these appear in the constants λ_k, see (b) in Section 3). The scalar functions h_j satisfy [CDK, Lemma 9.9]

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{N} h_j, \qquad \operatorname{supp} h_j \subset U_j \subset \Omega, \qquad \int_{U_j} h_j \omega = 0$$

On local chart (V_j, ϕ_j),

$$\int_{Q_j} h_j = 0, \qquad \operatorname{supp} h_j \subset Q_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

Each local equation (2.14) is now solved by [CDK, p.185, Lemma 9.8] (which is valid for arbitrary open cubes, see Footnote 5) and the pullback $\phi_j^* v_j$, still denoted by v_j, is extended by 0 to the whole M. As $h = \sum_{j=0}^N \operatorname{div} v_j = \operatorname{div}\left(\sum_{j=0}^N v_j\right)$ and $\operatorname{supp} v_j \subset \Omega$, $v = \sum_{j=0}^N v_j$ is the desired vector field. Observe that, by construction, h_j, v_j and finally v are C^∞ if h is C^∞ (i.e. if X, Y are C^∞), see also [CDK, p.184-188] and Section 3, (b) and (c). Now we have $Z_0 = w - v \in \mathfrak{X}^s_\mu(M)$ satisfying (1) to (3) and one finally gets Z still satisfying these three conditions and smooth in

$$\Delta = \{x \in M : Z(x) \neq X(x), Y(x)\}$$

applying the localized smoothing (Theorem 3) to Z_0 and Ω. □

[3] This fact will be used in (c), Section 3.

3. Linear bound on C^r norms

Instead of the standard Whitney C^r norm $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$, we adopt the equivalent but more convenient norm $|\cdot|_r$ defined in the Appendix (Section 5.1). Since $|\cdot|_{r;U} \leq \|\cdot\|_{C^r;U} \leq n^{(r+1)/2} |\cdot|_{r;U}$, (3) of Theorem 1 is proved letting $C = n^{(r+1)/2} C'$ and finding a constant $C' = C'(r, K, U)$ for which

$$|Z - X|_r < C' |Y - X|_{r;U} \tag{3.1}$$

(clearly, $C = C(r, K, U)$ since $n = \dim M = \dim U$). As

$$|Z - X|_r = |w - v - X|_r \leq |w - X|_r + |v|_r$$

$$|w - X|_r = |\alpha(Y - X)|_{r;U} \leq 2^r |\alpha|_r |Y - X|_{r;U}$$

it is enough to find a constant $C_0 = C_0(r, K, U) > 0$ such that $|v|_r \leq C_0 |Y - X|_{r;U}$ and let $C' = 2^r |\alpha|_r + C_0 + 1$ (as $|\alpha|_r$ depends only on r and Ω and thus ultimately only on r, K and U).[4] We will obtain a finite chain of linear bounds with constants C_1, C_2, C_3 depending only on r, K and U, finally leading to the desired inequality.

(a) $|h|_r \leq C_1 |Y - X|_{r;U}$. From the local chart expression of h (see (2.12) and (2.13) in the Preview) it follows that this inequality holds for $C_1 = n2^r |\alpha|_{r+1}$. Again, as $n = \dim U$ and $|\alpha|_{r+1}$ depends only on r, K and U, so does C_1.

(b) $|h_j|_r \leq C_2 |h|_r$. Following the reasoning in [CDK, Section 9.3, p.184-188] transposed to M, fix ψ_j, $\eta_k \in C^\infty(M; [0, 1])$ as in Lemma 9.9. Note that ψ_j, η_k depend ultimately only on K and U. Let

$$d_1 = \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} |\psi_j|_r , \qquad d_2 = \max_{1 \leq k \leq N} |\eta_k|_r$$

By definition, $h_j = h\psi_j + \sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k A_k^j \eta_k$ (see the proof of Lemma 9.9 in [CDK, p.185-188]) where each A_k^j (depending on the sequence $U_0, \ldots, U_N$) is either -1, 0 or 1 and the λ_k's are the constants solving $\sum_{k=1}^N \lambda_k A_k^j = \int_\Omega h\psi_j$, $0 \leq j \leq N$. In order to find the λ_k's, we solve the N simultaneous equations corresponding to $1 \leq j \leq N$, as matrix E obtained from $(N+1) \times N$ matrix $A = (A_k^j)$ truncating its first line is actually invertible and the solutions thus obtained automatically satisfy the equation corresponding to $j = 0$. Finding λ_k by Cramer rule, $\lambda_k = |B| / |E|$, and expanding determinant $|B|$ along the k-th column (knowing that $A_k^k = 1$, $A_k^j = -1$ or 0 if $j < k$, $A_k^j = 0$ if $j > k$ and each column of E contains, at most, two nonzero entries), we immediately get (recalling that $N \geq 3$)

$$|\lambda_k| \leq N2^{N-3} \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \left| \int_\Omega h\psi_j \right| \leq N2^{N-3} d_1 \operatorname{vol} \Omega \, |h|_r$$

$$|h_j|_r \leq |h\psi_j|_r + N \max_{0 \leq j \leq N} \left| \lambda_k A_k^j \eta_k \right|_r \leq C_2 |h|_r$$

where $C_2 = C_2(r, K, U) = 2^r d_1 + N^2 2^{N-3} d_1 d_2 \operatorname{vol} \Omega$.

(c) $|v_j|_r \leq C_3 |h_j|_r$. Recall that v_j is found on local chart (V_j, ϕ_j) as the solution of (1.1) given by [CDK, Lemma 9.8, p.185] and then extending its pullback by 0 to the whole M. Clearly, Lemma 9.8 [CDK] holds for each cube $Q_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.[5] Since $\operatorname{vol} Q_j \leq 1$, a simple induction argument over the dimension n (carried on the

[4] Note that, by hypothesis, $|Y - X|_{r;U} > 0$ (as $Y \not\equiv X|_U$), thus the inequality (3.1), with C' defined as above, is in fact always strict.

[5] The proof of Lemma 9.8 in [CDK, p.185] becomes valid for Q_j performing the obvious translation of the cube and changing ξ to $\xi_j \in C_0^\infty(]0, \lambda_j[)$, $\lambda_j = (\operatorname{vol} Q_j)^{1/n} \leq 1$, satisfying $\int_0^{\lambda_j} \xi_j = 1$. Each ξ_j is fixed and depends only on $\operatorname{vol} Q_j$, hence ultimately only on K and U.

modified proof of [CDK, Lemma 9.8], see Footnote 5) shows that, on local chart $(V_j,\, \phi_j)$,

$$|v_j|_r \leq (2^r\, |\xi_j|_r)^n\, |h_j|_r$$

Now, in order to get the global C^r norm of v_j we need to take into account the potential magnification of these local norms under chart transitions $(\phi_{ji})_{i,j\leq m}$. Since the transitions between the chart expressions of a vector field are of the form

$$X_j|_{\phi_j(V_i\cap V_j)} = \phi_{ji_*} X_i|_{\phi_i(V_i\cap V_j)}$$

it is easily seen that there is a constant

$$D = D(n, r, \max_{i,j\leq m}\left|\phi_{ji}\right|_{r+1}) \geq 1$$

such that

$$\left|X_j|_{\phi_j(V_i\cap V_j)}\right|_r \leq D\left|X|_{\phi_i(V_i\cap V_j)}\right|_r$$

for any $i,\, j \leq m$. The global C^r norm of v_j can then be estimated by

$$|v_j|_r \leq C_3\, |h_j|_r\,, \quad \text{where } C_3 = D(2^r d_0)^n, \qquad d_0 = \max_{0\leq j\leq N} |\xi_j|_r$$

As the atlas is fixed (and $n = \dim U$, see also Footnote 5), we actually have $C_3 = C_3(r, K, U)$.

(d) Finally, $v = \sum_{j=0}^{N} v_j$, hence $|v|_r \leq (N+1)\max_{0\leq j\leq N}\left|v_j\right|_r$, therefore,

$$|v|_r \leq (N+1)C_1C_2C_3\, |Y - X|_{r;U}$$

As $N+1$, C_1, C_2 and C_3 depend only on r, K, U, the desired constant is $C_0 = (N+1)C_1C_2C_3$.

4. Linearized conservative Franks lemma

We now state the linearized volume preserving version of Franks lemma. Since perturbations of diffeomorphisms are usually carried out via chart representations, as with Theorem 5, care has been taken to find a δ that directly estimates the permitted variation of the derivative on all local charts (see Section 5.2.3 for the terminology). If M is endowed with a Riemannian structure, it is easily seen that the more standard formulation given in Corollary 1 below can be deduced from

Theorem 6. (Linearized conservative Franks lemma). *Let M be a manifold as in Section 2. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a C^1 neighbourhood of $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1_\mu(M)$. Then, there is a smaller C^1 neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{U}$ of f and $\delta > 0$ such that: given*

- *any $g \in \mathcal{U}_0$;*
- *any finite set $\Sigma \subset M$;*
- *any neighbourhood U of Σ;*
- *any linear maps $A_x \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$, $x \in \Sigma$, satisfying*

$$\|A_x - Dg_x(x)\| < \delta$$

where g_x is some chart representation of g around x, there exists $\widetilde{g} \in \mathcal{U}$ having, for each $x \in \Sigma$, a chart representation $\widetilde{g_x}$ around x comparable with g_x and such that:

(1) $\widetilde{g_x}(y) = g_x(x) + A_x(y - x)$ *near x;*
(2) $\mathrm{supp}(\widetilde{g} - g) \subset U$.

Remark 3. for each $x \in \Sigma$, (1) implies $\widetilde{g}(x) = g(x)$, $D\widetilde{g_x}(x) = A_x$ and $\widetilde{g}$ is affine linear near x in chart representation $\widetilde{g_x}$.

Remark 4. When g is C^r, $r \geq 2$, the proof only guarantees that $\widetilde{g}$ is C^1 (c.f. the non-linearized version [BC, Proposition 6.1, p.79]). This limitation is due to the use of Avila's conservative localized smoothing [AV, Theorem 7] (see the proof of Lemma 2). Actually, in the notation of that paper, for f of class C^r, $r \geq 2$, Avila's result (with $K_0 = \emptyset$) does not guarantee that the resulting map $\widetilde{f}$ is C^2 at the

boundary points of the open set where the smoothing takes place (despite being C^r on the complement of that boundary).

Corollary 1. (Linearized conservative Franks lemma). *Let M be a manifold as in Section 2. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a C^1 neighbourhood of $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1_\mu(M)$. Then, there is a smaller C^1 neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}_0 \subset \mathcal{U}$ of f and $\delta > 0$ such that: given any $g \in \mathcal{U}_0$, any finite set $\Sigma \subset M$, any neighbourhood U of Σ and any volume preserving linear maps*

$$A_x : T_xM \longrightarrow T_{g(x)}M, \quad x \in \Sigma$$

such that every A_x is δ-close to the derivative of g at x, there exists $\widetilde{g} \in \mathcal{U}$ coinciding with g in U^c and in Σ, and such that at each point $x \in \Sigma$ the derivative of $\widetilde{g}$ is A_x and $\widetilde{g}$ is affine linear in some chart representation around x.

Proof. (of Theorem 6). We shall reduce the proof to that of Lemma 2 below. Fix a covering system $\{B_l\}_{l \leq \widetilde{m}}$, i, j for f, here called Υ, as in Section 5.2 and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathscr{U}_{\epsilon,\Upsilon}(f) \subset \mathcal{U}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathscr{U}_{\epsilon/2,\Upsilon}(f)$. Recall that, by definition of $\mathscr{U}_{\epsilon,\Upsilon}(f)$, the same covering system works for any $g \in \mathscr{U}_{\epsilon,\Upsilon}(f)$. For such g define

$$\|Dg\|_\Upsilon = \max_{l \leq \widetilde{m}} \sup_{B_{l*}} \|Dg_l\| \geq 1$$

Then, for $g \in \mathcal{U}_0$,

$$\|Dg\|_\Upsilon < \|Df\|_\Upsilon + \epsilon/2$$

As one wishes to be able to chose freely any chart representation to work with, we will need to estimate $\sup_M \|Dg\|$, the supremum of $\|Dg(x)\|$ for all $x \in M$ over all possible chart representations of g around x. The transitions between chart representations being of the form $\widehat{g} = \phi_{\widehat{j}j} \circ \widetilde{g} \circ \phi_{i\widehat{i}}$ one has that

$$\sup_M \|Dg\| \leq a^2 \|Dg\|_\Upsilon, \text{ where } a := \max_{i,j \leq m} \sup_{\phi_i(V_i \cap V_j)} \|D\phi_{ji}\|$$

$\phi_{ji} = \phi_j \circ \phi_i^{-1}$ being the chart transitions of the atlas $(V_i, \phi_i)_{i \leq m}$, therefore for any $g \in \mathcal{U}_0$,

$$\sup_M \|Dg\| < c := a^2 (\|Df\|_\Upsilon + \epsilon/2) > 1$$

Note that we need not concern with the C^0 norm of $\widetilde{g} - g$ since it becomes as small as wished if $\mathrm{supp}(\widetilde{g} - g)$ is contained in the disjoint union of $|\Sigma|$ sufficiently small balls centred at the points of Σ (on local charts). This also guarantees that (2) holds. Hence, only the distance between the derivatives of $\widetilde{g}$ and g is of concern. Performing adequate translations in both domain and target of each chart representation g_x around x, it is now easily seen that that the problem reduces to prove Lemma 2 and finding through it the $\delta > 0$ corresponding to $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon/4a^2$ and the above constant c. The reason for multiplying $\epsilon/2$ by $1/2a^2$ when defining ϵ_0 is that one needs to account for the possible magnification of the distance $\sup \|D\widetilde{g_x} - Dg_x\|$ when passing from one pair of comparable chart representations of $\widetilde{g}$ and g around $x \in \Sigma$ to any other such pair (over the same open neighbourhood of x, see below). It will guarantee, in particular, that, for $g \in \mathcal{U}_0$, $\|\widetilde{g} - g\|_{C^1} < \epsilon/2$ for the local metric induced on $\mathcal{U}$ by Υ, and therefore that one gets as wished

$$\|\widetilde{g} - f\|_{C^1} \leq \|\widetilde{g} - g\|_{C^1} + \|g - f\|_{C^1} < \epsilon/2 + \epsilon/2 = \epsilon$$

(Since there are only finitely many chart transitions ϕ_{ji} for the given atlas, it is easily seen from the expression giving the derivatives under chart representation transition,

$$D\widehat{g}_x(\widehat{y}) = D\phi_{\widehat{j}j}(g_x(y)) \circ Dg_x(y) \circ D\phi_{i\widehat{i}}(\widehat{y}), \quad y = \phi_{i\widehat{i}}(\widehat{y})$$

that reducing $\mathrm{supp}(\widetilde{g_x} - g_x)$ to a small enough ball centred at x (which Lemma 2 permits to do), for any other pair $\widehat{\widetilde{g_x}}, \widehat{g_x}$ of comparable chart representations of $\widetilde{g}$ and g over the same neighbourhood of x

$$\sup \|D(\widehat{\widetilde{g_x}} - \widehat{g_x})\| < 2a^2 \sup \|D(\widetilde{g_x} - g_x)\|$$

the constant 2 being replaceable by any $s > 1$ provided $\mathrm{supp}(\widetilde{g_x} - g_x)$ is taken small enough). □

From now on we assume that $\mathbb{R}^n$ and all its subsets are endowed with the standard volume form $dx_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge dx_n$.

Lemma 2. (Uniform conservative local linearization) *For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $c > 1$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that: given*

(a) *any volume preserving C^1 diffeomorphism onto its image*

$$f : \eta\mathbb{D}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \ \eta > 0$$

such that $f(0) = 0$ and

$$\|Df(0)\| < c$$

(b) *any $A \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$\|A - Df(0)\| < \delta$$

there exists a volume preserving C^1 diffeomorphism onto its image $f_A : \eta\mathbb{D}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

(1) *$f_A = A$ near 0;*
(2) *$\mathrm{supp}(f_A - f) \subset \eta\mathbb{B}^n$;*
(3) *$\|f_A - f\|_{C^1} < \epsilon_0$*

Remark 5. It is obviously impossible to have, for all f satisfying (a), f_A linear in a ball (centred at 0) whose radius is in a fixed proportion to that of the domain of f (i.e. given $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $c > 1$, we cannot find together with δ another constant $\rho > 0$ such that every f_A is linear in $\rho\eta\mathbb{B}^n$, the domain of f being $\eta\mathbb{D}^n$. This is clear since there is no possible uniform control (up to scale) over the variation of the derivative near 0 for all such f (c.f. [ACW, Corollary 6.9], whose proof is similar).

Proof. The result being trivially true for $n = 1$, the proof is carried out for $n \geq 2$.
(1) Conservative smoothing near 0. Using [AV, Theorem 7] followed by the elementary perturbation lemma (see e.g. [BC, Lemma A.4, p.93]), we can find for each f as in the statement, another volume preserving C^1 diffeomorphism onto its image $\widehat{f} : \eta\mathbb{D}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, as C^1 close to f as desired, which is smooth near 0 and satisfies $\widehat{f}(0) = 0$, $\|D\widehat{f}(0)\| < c$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\widehat{f} - f) \subset \eta\mathbb{B}^n$. It is then easily seen that *it is enough to prove the lemma for the subset of all smooth diffeomorphisms f satisfying* (a). We show that in this case, *the resulting diffeomorphism f_A is also C^∞*.
(2) Proof for f smooth.
(2.1) *Reducing to the case of diffeomorphisms with domain $\mathbb{B}^n$ C^2 close to* Id *and $A =$* Id. The core of the proof uses an homothety trick involving the second derivative that proved crucial in establishing Avila's result mentioned above. The argument is similar to that in [ACW, Lemma 6.8] (see however Remark 6). The starting point of this homothety trick is the following simple observation (taken in the case $r = 2$): suppose that $f : \mathbb{B}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, is a C^r ($r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$) diffeomorphism onto its image such that $f(0) = 0$. Then, re-scaling (through homothetic conjugation) the restriction $f|_{\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}$, $0 < \lambda < 1$, to the unit ball

$$\begin{array}{rccc} f_\lambda : & \mathbb{B}^n & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^n \\ & z & \longmapsto & \lambda^{-1} f(\lambda z) \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

one has

$$\|f_\lambda - Df(0)\|_{C^r;\mathbb{B}^n} \xrightarrow[\lambda\to 0]{} 0$$

(c.f. the Proof of Theorem 5). Actually, as mentioned above, we shall be dealing with the case f is C^∞ and will only use the fact that f_λ converges to $Df(0)$ in the C^2 norm. The final step (see **(2.3)** below) is achieved through another simple observation - the C^1 norm does not increase for contracting (scale decreasing) homothetic conjugations.

The following auxiliary fact follows readily from the compactness of

$$SL_c := \{D \in SL(n,\mathbb{R}) : \|D\| \le c\},\ c \ge 1$$

and the continuity of the the composition operator for matrices (in relation to the standard norm). Together with Fact 2, it will ultimately permit to find, for given $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and $c > 1$, a single δ working simultaneously for all f satisfying (a) (although both Fact 1 and 2 obviously admit more general formulations, we state them in the exact form needed in the present context to make their use obvious).

Fact 1. *For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $c \ge 1$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that: given any $A \in SL(n,\mathbb{R})$ and $D \in SL_c$*

$$\|A - D\| < \delta \Longrightarrow \left\|A^{-1} \circ D - \mathrm{Id}\right\| < \epsilon$$

The precise $\epsilon_0 - \delta$ chain establishing Lemma 2 can be easily reconstructed from the following reasoning, which makes the structure of the proof more transparent (the continuity of the composition, inversion, addition and multiplication operators in relation to the C^r norm ($r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$) will be systematically used without mention). Let $0 < \lambda < \eta$. For each smooth f satisfying (a), re-scale $f|_{\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}$ as in (4.1) getting a volume preserving smooth diffeomorphism onto its image $f_\lambda : \mathbb{B}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$. For each $A \in SL(n,\mathbb{R})$ let

$$h_{\lambda,A} = A^{-1} \circ f_\lambda$$

Then

$$\left\|h_{\lambda,A} - A^{-1} \circ Df(0)\right\|_{C^2;\mathbb{B}^n} \xrightarrow[\lambda\to 0]{} 0 \tag{4.2}$$

By Fact 1, as $Df(0) \in SL_c$, for δ small

$$\left\|A^{-1} \circ Df(0) - \mathrm{Id}\right\|_{C^2;\mathbb{B}^n} = \left\|A^{-1} \circ Df(0) - \mathrm{Id}\right\| \tag{4.3}$$

is uniformly small for all f satisfying (a) and all A satisfying (b), hence for λ small enough

$$\|h_{\lambda,A} - \mathrm{Id}\|_{C^2;\mathbb{B}^n} \text{ is small} \tag{4.4}$$

Remark 6. We stress that λ is taken as small as necessary, individually for each pair f, A, and cannot be taken uniformly for all f satisfying (a), see Remark 5.

Fix $\xi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{B}^n,[0,1])$ (the same for all f and A) such that $\xi = 0$ in $\frac{2}{6}\mathbb{D}^n$ and $\xi = 1$ in $\mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{3}{6}\mathbb{B}^n$ and define on $\mathbb{B}^n$

$$g_{\lambda,A} = \mathrm{Id} + \xi(h_{\lambda,A} - \mathrm{Id})$$

Then

$$\|g_{\lambda,A} - \mathrm{Id}\|_{C^2;\mathbb{B}^n} \text{ is small} \tag{4.5}$$

hence $g_{\lambda,A}$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image and

$$\left\|g_{\lambda,A}^{-1} - \mathrm{Id}\right\|_{C^2;\mathrm{im}\, g_{\lambda,A}} \text{ is small} \tag{4.6}$$

Letting $\theta_{\lambda,A} = \det Dg_{\lambda,A}^{-1}$, it follows that

$$\|\theta_{\lambda,A} - 1\|_{C^1;\mathrm{im}\, g_{\lambda,A}} \text{ is small} \tag{4.7}$$

(2.1*) *Correcting the volume distortion.* Let $\Omega = \frac{5}{6}\mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{D}^n$. Note that $\overline{\Omega} \subset \operatorname{im} g_{\lambda,A}$ by (4.5). We now find $\varphi_{\lambda,A} \in \operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\Omega})$ C^1 close to Id and with $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi_{\lambda,A} - \mathrm{Id}) \subset \Omega$, correcting (by composition) the volume distortion of $g_{\lambda,A}$ inside the "transition annulus" $\mathcal{A} = \frac{3}{6}\mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{2}{6}\mathbb{D}^n$ (note that $g_{\lambda,A}$ is volume preserving outside $\mathcal{A}$), i.e. such that

$$\det D\varphi_{\lambda,A} = \theta_{\lambda,A} \text{ in } \Omega$$

By definition of $g_{\lambda,A}$, (4.4) and (4,5) (essentially because of the smallness of the C^0 distance),

- $g_{\lambda,A}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}) \subset \frac{4}{6}\mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{2}{6}\mathbb{B}^n \subset \Omega$
- $\theta_{\lambda,A} = 1$ in $Q = \left(\frac{5}{6}\mathbb{D}^n \setminus \frac{4}{6}\mathbb{B}^n\right) \cup \frac{2}{6}\mathbb{D}^n$;
- $\int_\Omega \theta_{\lambda,A} = \operatorname{meas} \Omega$

(the last one as $\theta_{\lambda,A} = 1$ in $\frac{1}{6}\mathbb{D}^n$, $g_{\lambda,A}^{-1}(\frac{5}{6}\mathbb{D}^n) = h_{\lambda,A}^{-1}(\frac{5}{6}\mathbb{D}^n)$ and $h_{\lambda,A}^{-1}$ is volume preserving). Now as Ω is smooth and connected, and $\mathscr{C} = Q \setminus \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{B}^n$ is a compact collar of $\overline{\Omega}$, by [TE, Theorem 5] and [CDK, Lemma 10.4],[6] there is a constant $C = C(n) > 0$ and $\varphi_{\lambda,A} \in \operatorname{Diff}^\infty(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\Omega})$ such that (i) $\det D\varphi_{\lambda,A} = \theta_{\lambda,A}$, (ii) $\varphi_{\lambda,A} = \mathrm{Id}$ in $\mathscr{C}$ and

$$\|\varphi_{\lambda,A} - \mathrm{Id}\|_{C^1;\Omega} \leq C \|\theta_{\lambda,A} - 1\|_{C^1;\Omega} \tag{4.8}$$

Extend $\varphi_{\lambda,A}$ by Id to $\mathbb{R}^n$. By (4.7) and (4.8)

$$\|\varphi_{\lambda,A} - \mathrm{Id}\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} \text{ is small} \tag{4.9}$$

As it is immediate to verify,

$$\widetilde{g_{\lambda,A}} = \varphi_{\lambda,A} \circ g_{\lambda,A}$$

is a volume preserving smooth diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{B}^n$ onto its image and by (4.5) and (4.9)

$$\|\widetilde{g_{\lambda,A}} - \mathrm{Id}\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} \text{ is small} \tag{4.10}$$

We now have

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{g_{\lambda,A}} = \mathrm{Id} & \text{in } \frac{2}{6}\mathbb{D}^n \\ \widetilde{g_{\lambda,A}} = h_{\lambda,A} & \text{in } \mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{5}{6}\mathbb{B}^n \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

The first equality holds since $\varphi_{\lambda,A} = \mathrm{Id} = g_{\lambda,A}$ in $\frac{2}{6}\mathbb{D}^n$; as for the second it follows from (i) $g_{\lambda,A} = h_{\lambda,A}$ in $\mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{5}{6}\mathbb{B}^n$, (ii) $h_{\lambda,A}(\mathbb{B}^n \setminus \frac{5}{6}\mathbb{B}^n) \subset \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \frac{4}{6}\mathbb{B}^n$ (by (4.4)) and (iii) $\varphi_{\lambda,A} = \mathrm{Id}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \frac{4}{6}\mathbb{B}^n$.

(2.2) *Back to the general case.* Since by hypothesis

$$\|A - Df(0)\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} = \|A - Df(0)\| < \delta \text{ is small} \tag{4.12}$$

it follows from (4.10) and Fact 2 below that setting $\widetilde{f_{\lambda,A}} = A \circ \widetilde{g_{\lambda,A}}$, taking λ small enough for the given pair f, A,

$$\left\| \widetilde{f_{\lambda,A}} - Df(0) \right\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} \text{ is uniformly small} \tag{4.13}$$

for all f satisfying (a) and all A satisfying (b). The proof of Fact 2 is similar to that of Fact 1 and poses no difficulty.

[6] It can be verified that in [TE, Theorem 5], if the volume form f is smooth, the solution diffeomorphism φ is also smooth. This follows from the fact that the solution to the linearized problem $\operatorname{div} u = f - 1$ [TE, Theorem 3] depends only on f and not on r, α (see e.g. [TE, Remark 3 and Footnote 3]) and from the the way φ is found (integrating the time dependent vector field $u_t = u/((1-t)f + tg)$, see [CDK]). One then uses the estimate in [TE, Theorem 3] and that in [CDK, Lemma 10.4] to get (4.8).

Fact 2. *For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon > 0$ and $c \geq 1$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that: given any $A \in SL(n,\mathbb{R})$, $D \in SL_c$ and a C^1 diffeomorphism onto its image $g : \mathbb{B}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$\|A - D\|, \|g - \mathrm{Id}\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} < \delta \Longrightarrow \|A \circ g - D\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} < \epsilon$$

Now, it is immediate to verify that

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{f_{\lambda,A}} = A \text{ near } 0 \\ \widetilde{f_{\lambda,A}} - f_\lambda \text{ is compactly supported in } \mathbb{B}^n \end{cases}$$

(2.3) *Scaling down to the real scale.* It remains to scale down $\widetilde{f_{\lambda,A}}$ back to the real scale. Let

$$\begin{array}{rccc} f_{\lambda,A} : & \lambda\mathbb{B}^n & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{R}^n \\ & z & \longmapsto & \lambda\widetilde{f_{\lambda,A}}(\lambda^{-1}z) \end{array}$$

Since the C^1 norm does not increase under contracting homothetic conjugation, taking δ small enough we have

$$\|f_{\lambda,A} - Df(0)\|_{C^1;\lambda\mathbb{B}^n} \leq \left\|\widetilde{f_{\lambda,A}} - Df(0)\right\|_{C^1;\mathbb{B}^n} < \epsilon_0/2 \tag{4.14}$$

for λ small enough (again, depending on the pair f, A), and taking λ even smaller if necessary, we can further guarantee that

$$\|f - Df(0)\|_{C^1;\lambda\mathbb{B}^n} < \epsilon_0/2$$

Therefore, as $f_{\lambda,A} - f|_{\lambda\mathbb{B}^n}$ is compactly supported in $\lambda\mathbb{B}^n$, extending $f_A := f_{\lambda,A}$ by f to the whole $\eta\mathbb{D}^n$ we finally get by the triangle inequality that

$$(3) \quad \|f_A - f\|_{C^1;\eta\mathbb{D}^n} < \epsilon_0$$

and it is immediate to check that f_A is smooth and satisfies (1) and (2). □

5. Appendix

5.1. C^r **norms.** Let $|\cdot|$ be the euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Fix a (finite) regular[7] C^∞ atlas $(V_j, \phi_j)_{j\leq m}$ of M. Let $U \subset M$ be an open set and X a vector field of class C^r defined on U. On each partial local chart associated with U, $(V_j \cap U, \phi_j|_{V_j\cap U})$, X has an expression

$$X_j : \phi_j(V_j \cap U) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{X}^r(U)$ the space of vector fields of class C^r, $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$, defined on U, for which the following quantity (the Whitney C^r norm of X) is finite:

$$\|X\|_{C^r;U} := \max_{j;\, 0\leq k\leq r} \sup_{\phi_j(V_j\cap U)} \left\|D^k X_j\right\|$$

(here $\|D^0X_j(x)\| := |X_j(x)|$ and $\|D^kX_j(x)\| := \max_{u_i\in\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |D^kX_j(x;\, u_1, \ldots, u_k)|$). In Section 3 we work with the equivalent norm

$$|X|_{r;U} := \max_{i,j;\, 0\leq|\alpha|\leq r} \sup_{\phi_j(V_j\cap U)} \left|\partial^\alpha X_j^i\right|$$

where $X_j = (X_j^1, \ldots, X_j^n)$ and α runs over all multiindices $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ for which $|\alpha| = \sum \alpha_i \leq r$. It is easily seen that

$$|\cdot|_{r;U} \leq \|\cdot\|_{C^r;U} \leq n^{(r+1)/2}\, |\cdot|_{r;U}$$

noting that $\max_{x\in\mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$ is attained when $|x_1| = \cdots = |x_n| = n^{-1/2}$, thus implying that $\lambda \leq \|D^kX_j(x)\| \leq n^{(k+1)/2}\lambda$ for $\lambda = \max_{i;\,|\alpha|=k} |\partial^\alpha X_j^i(x)|$.

The same definitions are adopted for the C^r norms of maps $X \in C^r(U;\mathbb{R}^q)$ (the local chart expressions of X being then of the form $X_j = X \circ \phi_i^{-1}$), provided we

[7]Here regular means that there is another atlas $(W_i, \theta_i)_{i\leq m}$ such that $\overline{V_i} \subset W_i$ and $\theta_i|_{V_i} = \phi_i$, thus guaranteeing that $\|\cdot\|_{C^r}$ is finite for any C^r map with domain M.

restrict to the subspace of those that are C^r bounded (see Definition 1). In this context, if $h \in C^r(U)$ and either $X \in \mathfrak{X}^r(U)$ or $X \in C^r(U;\mathbb{R}^q)$, then by Leibniz product rule,

$$|hX|_{r;U} \leq 2^r \, |h|_{r;U} \, |X|_{r;U}$$

an inequality systematically used in Section 3.

5.2. **Local metrization and chart representations for $\mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$.**

Definition 2. $\mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, is the group of C^r diffeomorphisms of M. We denote by $\mathrm{Diff}^r_\mu(M)$ the subgroup of $\mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$ consisting of those g preserving the volume form ω, or equivalently, the Lebesgue measure μ induced by it on M.

5.2.1. *Covering system for $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$.* Fix an atlas $(V_i, \phi_i)_{i\leq m}$ of M as before (see the Convention, Section 2). Given $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, by the compactness of M one can find a constant $\eta > 0$, a finite open cover $B_{l\leq \widetilde{m}}$ of M and two maps

$$i,\, j : \{1, \ldots, \widetilde{m}\} \longrightarrow \{1, \ldots, m\}$$

such that

$$\overline{B_l} \subset V_{i(l)}; \qquad B_{l*} := \phi_{i(l)}(B_l) = \eta\mathbb{B}^n; \qquad f(\overline{B_l}) \subset V_{j(l)}$$

The triple $B_{l\leq\widetilde{m}}$, i, j, is called a *covering system for f* and will be denoted by Υ. For each $\epsilon > 0$, let $\mathscr{U}_{\epsilon,\Upsilon}(f)$ be the set of those $g \in \mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$ such that for all $l \leq \widetilde{m}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 \ni s \leq r$

(1) $g(\overline{B_l}) \subset V_{j(l)}$
(2) $\|D^s(g_l - f_l)\| < \epsilon$, where

$$g_l = \phi_{j(l)} \circ g \circ \phi^{-1}_{i(l)}|_{B_{l*}}$$

f_l being defined in the analogue way. These $\mathscr{U}_{\epsilon,\Upsilon}(f)$ induce a topology on $\mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$ (see e.g. [PR, p.262]), making it locally metrizable by the standard Whitney C^r norm: for any h, $g \in \mathscr{U}_{\epsilon,\Upsilon}(f)$,

$$d_{C^r}(h, g) := \|h - g\|_{C^r} = \max_{l\leq\widetilde{m}} \|h_l - g_l\|_{C^r}$$

Clearly, a covering system for f also works for any $g \in \mathscr{U}_{\epsilon,\Upsilon}(f)$, $\epsilon > 0$.

5.2.2. *Chart representations of $f|_B$.* Given $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$ suppose that $B \subset M$ is an open set such that $\overline{B} \subset V_i$ and $f(\overline{B}) \subset V_j$ for some $i, j \leq m$. Then

$$\widehat{f} = f_{ji,B} = \phi_j \circ f \circ \phi_i^{-1}\big|_{B_*}, \quad B_* = \phi_i(B)$$

is a *chart representation of $f|_B$* (alternatively, *of f over B*). If $x \in B$ we call $\widehat{f}$ a *chart representation of f around x*. To simplify the notation, we abbreviate by x the point $\phi_i(x)$ representing x in the domain of $\widehat{f}$.

5.2.3. *Comparable chart representations.* Given any other $g \in \mathrm{Diff}^r(M)$ such that $g(\overline{B}) \subset V_j$, $\widehat{f} = f_{ji,B}$ and $\widehat{g} = g_{ji,B}$ are called *comparable chart representations of $f|_B$ and $g|_B$* (alternatively, *of f and g over B*). By the continuity of the composition operator in relation to the C^r norm, if $\|\widehat{f} - \widehat{g}\|_{C^r}$ is small then $\|\widetilde{f} - \widetilde{g}\|_{C^r}$ is small for any other pair of comparable chart representations of $f|_B$ and $g|_B$. Thus, a C^r perturbation of a chart representation of $f|_B$ results in C^r perturbations of all other chart representations of $f|_B$, the transition between two such chart representations being explicitly given by

$$f_{\widehat{j}\widehat{i},B} = \phi_{\widehat{j}j} \circ f_{ji;B} \circ \phi_{i\widehat{i}}$$

5.3. **Statement and proof of Lemma 3.**

Lemma 3. *Let M be a (second countable, Hausdorff) connected, boundaryless C^∞ n-manifold. Given a compact subset K with an open neighbourhood $U \subsetneq M$ such that $U \setminus K$ is connected, there is a compact n-submanifold V with connected C^∞ boundary such that $K \subset \operatorname{int} V$ and $V \subset U$.*

Proof. Take a finite cover $B_1, \dots, B_j$ of K by open euclidean balls[8] such that $V_0 := \cup_{i \le j} \overline{B_i} \subset U$. Slightly perturbing the $\overline{B_i}$'s if necessary, we can assume that the smooth $(n-1)$-spheres $\partial \overline{B_i}$ intersect transversely so that V_0 is a compact n-submanifold with piecewise smooth boundary. Smooth out the "edges" of V_0 so that the resulting n-submanifold V_1 has C^∞ boundary and still satisfies $K \subset \operatorname{int} V_1$ and $V_1 \subset U$ (this is clearly possible since the smoothing can be performed arbitrarily near ∂V_0). Assume that ∂V_1 is disconnected (otherwise we are done). The idea is to use the connectedness of $U \setminus K$ to connect successively and inside $U \setminus K$, all the components of ∂V_1, thus creating a new submanifold satisfying the desired conclusions. Needless to say, care must be taken to avoid the intercrossing of the "connecting tubes", the nature of the "connecting surgery" depending, at each step i, on whether the tube connecting two components of ∂V_i is contained in $V_i \setminus K$ or in $U \setminus \operatorname{int} V_i$ (see below).

There is no difficulty in showing that given any component b_0 of ∂V_1 there is a distinct component b_1 and an injective C^∞ path $\gamma : [0,1] \to U \setminus K$, $\gamma'(t) \neq 0$, such that

$$\gamma(0) \in b_0, \qquad \gamma(]0,1[) \cap \partial V_1 = \emptyset, \qquad \gamma(1) \in b_1$$

and γ is transverse to ∂V_1 at $\gamma(0)$, $\gamma(1)$. Clearly, $\gamma^* := \gamma(]0,1[)$ is contained either in (I) $(\operatorname{int} V_1) \setminus K$ or in (II) $U \setminus V_1$. Thicken the embedded segment $\gamma([0,1])$ to a thin C^∞ embedded "tube" $\mathbb{D}^{n-1} \times [0,1] \overset{f_1}{\hookrightarrow} U \setminus K$ with its bases $\mathbb{D}^{n-1} \times 0$ and $\mathbb{D}^{n-1} \times 1$ attached (respectively) to b_0 and b_1 so that:

(1) the "outer cylinder" $\mathbb{S}^{n-2} \times [0,1]$ is smoothly attached to b_0 and b_1;
(2) as γ^*, $C = f_1(\mathbb{D}^{n-1} \times]0,1[)$ is disjoint from ∂V_1.

Now, as γ^*, C is contained either in (I) or in (II). In the first case let

$$V_2 = V_1 \setminus f_1(\mathbb{B}^{n-1} \times [0,1]) \qquad (\text{"worm-hole drilling"})$$

and in the second

$$V_2 = V_1 \cup f_1(\mathbb{D}^{n-1} \times [0,1]) \qquad (\text{"solid handle attaching"})$$

Since V_2 is obtained from V_1 modifying inside $U \setminus K$ only, it is immediate that V_2 is also an n-submanifold with C^∞ boundary still satisfying $K \subset \operatorname{int} V_2$ and $V_2 \subset U$, but ∂V_2 has one component less than ∂V_1. If ∂V_2 is still disconnected, then use a finite induction argument: we do with V_2 exactly what was done with V_1, decreasing again the number of boundary components by 1. After $k-1$ steps ($k =$ number of components of ∂V_1) we get a manifold $V = V_k$ as desired. □

References

[AM] A. Arbieto, C. Matheus. *A pasting lemma and some applications for conservative systems*, Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. 27 (2007) 1399-1417.

[AM2] A. Arbieto, C. Matheus. *Corrigendum to "A pasting lemma and some applications for conservative systems"* (electronic page).

[AV] A. Avila. *On the regularization of conservative maps*, Acta Math. 205 (2010), no. 1, 5–18.

[ACW] A. Avila, S. Crovisier, A. Wilkinson. *Diffeomorphisms with positive metric entropy* - v3. preprint arXiv.

[BC] C. Bonnatti, S. Crovisier. *Récurrence et généricité,* Invent. math. 158, 33–104 (2004).

[8] $D \subset M$ is an euclidean open ball if there is some local chart (V_i, ϕ_i) such that $\overline{D} \subset V_i$ and, up to a translation, $\phi_i(D) = \lambda \mathbb{B}^n$ for some $\lambda > 0$.

[CDK] G. Csató, B. Dacorogna, O. Kneuss. *The pullback equation for differential forms*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 83. Birkhäuser/Springer, 2012.

[DM] B. Dacorogna, J. Moser. *On a partial differential equation involving the Jacobian determinant*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 7 (1990), no. 1, 1–26.

[HI] M. Hirsch, *Differential Topology*, Corrected reprint of the 1976 original. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 33. Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[MO] J. Moser, *On the volume elements on a manifold*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 120 (1965), 286–294.

[PR] C. Pugh, C. Robinson, *The C^1 closing lemma, including Hamiltonians,* Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. (1983), 3, 261-313.

[TE] P. Teixeira, *Dacorogna-Moser theorem with control of support*, preprint arXiv.

[ZU] C. Zuppa, *Régularisation C^∞ des champs vectoriels qui préservent l'élément de volume.* Bol. Soc. Brasil. Mat. 10 (1979), no. 2, 51–56.

Centro de Matemática da Universidade do Porto
Rua do Campo Alegre, 687, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal
E-mail: pteixeira.ir@gmail.com
E-mail2: pedro.teixeira@fc.up.pt